

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

<b>In re United States Patent Application of:</b>	)	<b>Docket No.: 4258-116</b>
	)	
	)	
<b>Applicants: ALONSO FERNANDEZ, Maria Jose, et al.</b>	)	<b>Conf. No.: 9386</b>
	)	
<b>Application No.: 10/561,548</b>	)	<b>Art Unit: 1618</b>
	)	
<b>Date Filed: December 20, 2005</b>	)	<b>Examiner: Nissa M. Westerberg</b>
	)	
<b>Title: HYALURONIC ACID NANOPARTICLES</b>	)	<b>Customer No.: 23448</b>
	)	

**CERTIFICATE OF EFS FILING**

I hereby certify that this document is being filed via EFS in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on **April 9, 2008**.  
/Steven J. Hultquist/

---

**RESPONSE TO MARCH 18, 2008 RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT IN U.S. PATENT  
APPLICATION NO. 10/561,548**

---

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This responds to the March 18, 2008 Office Action in the above-identified application.

In the March 18, 2008 Office Action, a restriction requirement was imposed against the claims 1-28, as between:

- Group I**, claims 1-15, 26 and 27, drawn to a method of obtaining nanoparticles;
- Group II**, claims 16-22, drawn to nanoparticles for administration of an active ingredient;
- Group III**, claims 23-25, drawn to a pharmaceutical or cosmetic compositions comprising nanoparticles; and
- Group IV**, claim 29, drawn to a method of treating a subject with an active ingredient.

In response, Applicants elect **Group II, claims 16-22** drawn to nanoparticles for administration of an active ingredient.

In the March 18, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner has further imposed a cationic polymer species election requirement, identifying claims 9 and 10 as examples of acceptable species for such polymer.

In response, Applicants hereby select **chitosan** as the elected cationic polymer species.

The elected claims of Group II readable on such elected cationic polymer species are **claims 16-20 and 22**.

It is noted that the Office Action at page 2 contains a typographical error, in that Group IV should have referred to claim 28 and not claim 29, since the application contains only 28 claims and claim 28 corresponds to the method described for Group IV.

It is requested that the claims of Groups I, III and IV be rejoined with the claims 16-22 of Group II upon finding of allowable subject matter in the Group II claims, pursuant to the rejoinder provisions of MPEP 821.04.

It is requested that examination and prosecution of the application proceed, consistent with the foregoing election of claims and cationic polymer species.

Respectfully submitted,

/steven j. hultquist/

---

Steven J. Hultquist  
Reg. No. 28,021  
Attorney for Applicants

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY/  
TECHNOLOGY LAW  
Phone: (919) 419-9350  
Fax: (919) 419-9354  
Attorney File No.: 4258-116

<p>The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of fees properly payable for this document to Deposit Account No. 08-3284</p>
--